

Application No. 10/723,397

Amendment Date December 31, 2007; Reply to Office Action of October 4, 2007

Remarks/Arguments

Applicant appreciates the helpful feedback and guidance received from Examiner Bitar in the “Response to Arguments” and “Examiner Notes” sections.

In light of the Examiner Bitar’s feedback, the applicant has carefully re-reviewed Kurosawa et al (U.S. Patent 4,972,499), McConnell (U.S. Patent 4,567,610) and Silver et al (U.S. Patent 7,164,796). Applicant feels that even though the current invention is not covered by the prior arts even in its best combination, the previous claims may not have fully expressed the essence of the current invention as follows:

1. We create high precision matching function by interpolating the regular matching function of prior art to make it a function of subpixel values or invariant high precision parameters.
2. We perform high precision match by high precision matching function maximization.
3. The high precision matching function maximization using the initial search result directly without the re-creation of search result.
4. The same template for regular (no-high precision) matching is used for high precision matching function maximization.

Based on the above understanding, the claims are amended to overcome the claim rejections. The applicant was hoping to have an informal phone correspondence with Examiner Bitar before this RCE filing. However, due to the holiday season, the applicant was not able to do it in time. The applicant hopes to have this opportunity in the RCE prosecution process.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

We improve the independent claims 1, 14, 17 and 20 to clearly reflect the current invention.

Dependent claims 6, 11, and 23 are amended to reflect the patentable elements of the current invention.

Claims 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 are canceled.

Application No. 10/723,397

Amendment Date December 31, 2007; Reply to Office Action of October 4, 2007


Conclusion

In view of the above remarks and arguments, applicant submits that the amendments to claims overcome claim rejections under 35 USC §103. Therefore applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, which action applicant respectfully solicits.

Conditional Request for Constructive Assistance

If for any reason this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to MPEP para. 707.07(j) in order that the undersigned can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,



Shih-Jong J. Lee